

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 9, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25, and has canceled claims 7, 8, 18, 21, and 24. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sekizawa* (US 6,604,212 B2). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Sekizawa* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in independent claim 1, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended independent device claim 1 to recite that 1) the timer measures elapsed time, and 2) the base time setting module sets the absolute time as a base time for specifying a time at each time point, with the time at each time point being specified based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

The *Sekizawa* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the configuration defined in present claim 1. In particular, as will be explained in more detail below, the *Sekizawa* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed feature of specifying a time at each time point based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

The *Sekizawa* reference discloses that the CPU 30 goes to step S047 and waits for a response to the request command (see column 26, lines 36-39), and that the status code getting date and time are obtained at step S047 (see column 27, lines 7-8). At column 21, lines 39-44, *Sekizawa* discloses that the timer monitor section that monitors the timing at which the local information getting section 11 gets the status information Ø1, and the timing at which the local information transmission section 13 transmits the status information Ø1.

The *Sekizawa* reference, however, does not describe any relation between the status code getting date and time obtained at step S047, and the timing monitored by the timer

monitor section. Thus, the *Sekizawa* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the configuration defined in claim 1 for at least the reason that the reference does not disclose the claimed feature of specifying a time at each time point based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Sekizawa*. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Sekizawa* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Suzuki et al.* (“*Suzuki*”) (US 2002/0065940 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Suzuki* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in independent claim 20, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended independent method claim 20 to recite 1) activating a timer included in the device to measure elapsed time, and 2) setting the absolute time as a base time for specifying a time at each time point, the time at each time point being specified based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

The *Suzuki* reference does not disclose (or suggest) each and every feature of the method defined in present claim 20. In particular, as will be explained in more detail below, the *Suzuki* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed operation of setting the absolute time as a base time for specifying a time at each time point, the time at each time point being specified based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

The *Suzuki* reference discloses that controller 2 includes global timer 7, control unit 4, control period timer 10, and timer synchronous unit 12. The timer synchronous unit 12 determines the correction value of control period timer 10 from the time difference between the time indicated by global timer 7 and the system sync time of periodic control; and sets the

correction value in control period timer 10 (see Paragraphs 0069-0070). The *Suzuki* reference further discloses that devices 3a, 3b include global timers 8a, 8b, device operation units 5a, 5b, operation period timers 11a, 11b, and timer synchronous units 12a, 12b. The timer synchronous units 12a, 12b determine the correction values of operation timers 11a, 11b from the time indicated by global timers 8a, 8b and the system sync time of periodic control, and set the correction values in operation period timers 11a, 11b (see Paragraphs 0069, 0071).

However, as disclosed in Paragraphs 0070-0071 of the *Suzuki* reference, the synchronize operations are performed based on the control period timer 10 or operation period timers 11a, 11b. Furthermore, the time is designated with only control period timer 10 or operation period timers 11a, 11b. Thus, the *Suzuki* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the method defined in claim 20 for at least the reason that the reference does not disclose the claimed operation of setting the absolute time as a base time for specifying a time at each time point, the time at each time point being specified based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 20, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Suzuki*.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekizawa*. Claim 4 ultimately depends from claim 1. Nothing in the *Sekizawa* reference cures the above-discussed deficiencies of this reference relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Further, Applicant traverses the taking of official notice and, in the event the rejection is maintained, requests that a reference be cited to support the Examiner's position regarding the state of the art. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Sekizawa* for at least the reason that this claim ultimately depends from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7-19 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Suzuki* (as noted above, claims 7, 8, 18, 21, and 24 have been canceled herein). Each of claims 2-6 and 9-17 ultimately depends from claim 1. As discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejections, neither the *Sekizawa* reference nor the *Suzuki* reference discloses or suggests the claimed feature of specifying a time at each time point based on the elapsed time measured by the timer and the base time. Thus, even if the references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of the combination would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-6 and 9-17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Suzuki* for at least the reason that each of these claims ultimately depends from claim 1.

Considering next independent claim 19, Applicant has amended this claim, which defines a printing system, to recite a time specification module that specifies a time at each time point, based on the absolute time received by said time acquisition module *and elapsed time from a reception of the print file, the elapsed time being calculated using the relative time*. The elapsed time feature is similar to the corresponding features specified in present claims 1 and 20. Thus, for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with the anticipation rejections, neither the *Sekizawa* reference nor the *Suzuki* discloses or suggests a time specification module as defined in present claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Suzuki*.

Turning to independent claims 20 and 23, claim 20 is a method claim that corresponds to claim 1, and claim 23 is a computer-readable storage medium claim that corresponds to claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, the result

of the combination of the *Sekizawa* and *Suzuki* references would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 20 and 23. Accordingly, claims 20 and 23, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Suzuki*. Claim 22, which depends from claim 20, and claim 25, which depends from claim 23, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Suzuki* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to the applicable independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP068).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Customer Number 25920